

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are pending and being considered. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO 1449 paper and cited references.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,273,204 (“Winner et al.”).

Claim 1 recites, in relevant part, an arrangement for allowing a distance to a preceding vehicle to be set by a driver of the vehicle in the form of a **time gap**. The cited portions of Winner et al. refer to calculating a difference between determined actual spacing and a desired spacing D_{des} . Thus, Winner et al. refers to a distance gap, not a time gap. Similarly, Winner et al. fails to describe the features of claim 1 of an arrangement for changing longitudinal dynamics of the speed control **when the time gap changes** and an arrangement for increasing, **given a decrease in the time gap**, at least one of a maximum possible vehicle acceleration and a maximum possible vehicle deceleration implementable by a speed control system so that the vehicle is capable of at least one of accelerating and decelerating more quickly given the decrease in the time gap.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites, in relevant part, an arrangement for first **activating, given the decrease in the time gap, deceleration devices of the vehicle at a shorter distance** from the preceding vehicle. Nothing in the cited portions of Winner et al. describe activating deceleration devices at a shorter distance from the proceeding vehicle. Instead, Winner et al. refers to activating the brakes if a reduction of engine power is insufficient to hold a desired deceleration.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Winner et al. does not anticipate claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 5, as presented, recites features essentially analogous to claim 1, as presented, and therefore is allowable for at least the similar reasons

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons, as discussed above.

In sum, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 2 and 5 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the objection and rejections have been obviated, and that pending and considered claims are therefore allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 18 June 2007

By:



Michelle Carnahan
Reg. No 36098

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646